COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL
PARASITOLOGY (FORMERLY HELMINTHOLOGY)
WINOHEB FARM,
HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS.

VOLUME 9. Part 7 — 11th May 1954
pp. 191-222

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

11 MAY 1954

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology : Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 191

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases 192

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
by the International Trust
at its Publications Office,
41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence
(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Professor Béla Hankó (*Békéscsaba, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 7 (pp. 191–222) 11th May 1954

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51–56, 57–59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5–13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission may start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (vol. 9, Part 7) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases

1. NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers, is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

(1) *Stentor Oken*, 1815 (Class Ciliophora) validation of, and designation of a type species in harmony with accustomed usage (Z.N.(S.) 261) ;

(2) *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) validation of (Z.N.(S.)708).

2. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin :* other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

3. In accordance with the arrangement agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56) corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications " Nature " and " Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

11*th May* 1954.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF NEW NAMES PUBLISHED IN OKEN, [1815-1816], " LEHRBUCH DER NATURGESCHICHTE "

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

(Reference : Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 13)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)153)

I. Introductory

In pursuance of the request addressed to me by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the third of their Meetings held during their Paris Session on Monday 26th July 1948 (Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 13), I submit herewith for the consideration of the Commission and of interested zoologists generally the following Report on the question of the status of new names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, Volume **3** (Zoologie), issued in two *Abtheilungen*, of which the first (" Fleischlose Thiere ", pp. xxviii, 842, xviii, iv, 40 pls.) appeared in 1815 and the second (" Fleischthiere ", xvi, 1270 [2], 1 *tab*, with pp. 843–50 supplementary to *Abth.* 1) in 1816.

2. An authoritative statement on the status of new names in the *Lehrbuch* is long overdue, for there has been great diversity of practice among zoologists in regard to this matter, specialists in some branches (particularly in mammalogy) having in recent decades taken to using some or all of these names, while specialists in other groups have largely ignored this work. The late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood of Chicago therefore rendered a valuable service when in 1944 he invited the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to give an authoritative ruling on this subject.

3. It was evident from the outset that considerable difficulties must be anticipated, whatever the decision taken by the Commission. If the Commission were to rule that in the *Lehrbuch* Oken had complied with the requirements of the *Règles*, a great deal of work would be involved in many groups in determining the application of the numerous names which would then be seen to possess availability either as generic or subgeneric names and, in view of the early date of the *Lehrbuch*, there was every likelihood that this investigation would show that some, possibly many, of the Oken names were applicable to, and were the oldest names for, genera for which later names were in common use. If, on the other hand, the Commission were to rule that in the *Lehrbuch* Oken had not complied with the requirements of the *Règles*, then also it was evident that well-known genera currently known by Oken names would be found to require new names under the Law of Priority. In either case therefore it was certain that important issues affecting the stability of nomenclature were involved in the status to be accorded to names published in the *Lehrbuch*.

4. At the time when Dr. Osgood submitted his application, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for the Commission to reach a conclusion on this matter, for a large part of the arguments which had been advanced for and against the acceptance of Oken's names turned on the meaning to be attached to the expression " nomenclature binaire " which then figured in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25. This latter problem, which formerly had been the cause of much controversy, was, at the time of the receipt of Dr. Osgood's application, *sub judice*, the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 having decided that it was essential that this matter should be settled once and for all at the next (Thirteenth) International Congress and having, to this end, instructed the Commission to prepare a comprehensive Report on this subject for consideration by the Thirteenth Congress.

5. The question of the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire ", the settlement of which was—as already explained—a pre-requisite to the consideration of the status of Oken's *Lehrbuch* names was disposed of by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in July 1948. On the unanimous recommendation of the Commission, with the equally unanimous support of the Section on Nomenclature, the Congress, after ruling that the foregoing expression had a meaning identical with that of the expression " nomenclature binominale ", decided to delete from Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 (and also from Article 26) the expression " nomenclature binaire " and to replace it by the expression " nomenclature binominale " (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63–66). At the same time the Congress recognised that, where under the foregoing clarification of the *Règles*, it became evident that a given book did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25, rapid use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers would be needed to prevent instability from arising in the nomenclature of any group in which names first published in the book concerned were in common use. For this purpose, the Congress decided that in such cases the prescribed period of waiting might be waived by the Commission which should therefore be free at once to act for the purpose of preventing well-known names from being discarded in favour of names hitherto treated as synonyms (*see* Proceedings of the Commission, Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 13(3)(*a*)(iii), published in 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 65).

6. Later during its Paris meeting the Thirteenth Congress approved also a recommendation that words should be inserted in the *Règles* making clear the meaning of the expression " les principes de la nomenclature binominale ", as used in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 (as amended earlier during the Congress). As so clarified, Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 provides that, in order to qualify as having applied " les principes de la nomenclature binominale " in any given work, an author must have consistently applied those principles in the book in question and not merely in a particular section or passage (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 175). The purpose, and the effect, of this clarification of Article 25 is to make it clear that, when an author who does not use a binominal system of nomenclature nevertheless here or there in a given work applies to some species a name which, by reason of consisting of two words only, happens to constitute a binominal combination, the name in question is not to be treated as acquiring availability under the *Règles*.

7. The late Dr. Osgood's application regarding the status of names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch* was considered by the Commission at the third of its meetings held on Monday, 26th July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 365-366). In the discussion which then took place stress was laid upon the importance and urgency of the problem submitted by Dr. Osgood. It was then explained that the application had not been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 365) ; nor has it since been published, as it was considered that it would be more convenient if publication were to be delayed until the present Report was also available. It is now annexed as Appendix I. At the Paris meeting it was felt that a further opportunity for study was desirable, in which to examine the situation anew in the light of the decisions that had just been taken to amend and clarify Proviso (*b*) to Article 25. The situation was complicated both by the diversity of practice among zoologists in different parts of the Animal Kingdom and by the fact that, owing to its rarity, relatively few zoologists had had an opportunity of studying Oken's *Lehrbuch* at first hand. The Commission therefore agreed (*a*) to take into consideration Dr. Osgood's application in regard to Oken's *Lehrbuch* as soon as possible after the close of the Paris Congress, and (*b*), for the purpose of facilitating that consideration, to invite the Secretary to confer with specialists on the question of the practice (whether acceptance or rejection) adopted in their respective groups, and to submit a Report thereon.

II. On the question whether in the "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte" Oken consistently applied the principles of binominal nomenclature

8. In the early part of 1944, shortly before the receipt of Dr. Osgood's application in regard to the status of names in Oken's *Lehrbuch*, I had occasion myself to investigate this matter in connection with a proposal submitted to the Commission by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles that the names of genera of the Order Carnivora from species of which had been reported parasites common to Man should, because of their importance from the point of view of Public Health, be added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. For among the names which thus became candidates for admission to the *Official List* there were three Oken names (*Genetta* Oken ; *Grison* Oken ; *Tayra* Oken). At that time the principal scientific libraries had been evacuated from London to avoid risk of destruction by air-raids and it was therefore not possible for me personally either to examine the entries in Oken's *Lehrbuch* in regard to the foregoing names or to review the conclusions in regard to the status to be accorded to that work which I had formed when before the outbreak of war I had had occasion to consider this question in the course of my survey of the generic names of the butterflies. There was however, as I knew, a copy of the *Lehrbuch* in the library of the Zoological Museum, Tring, and I accordingly sought the assistance in this matter of Dr. Karl Jordan, at that time the President of the International Commission. Dr. Jordan at once undertook to investigate this matter and in a letter dated 10th June 1944 he very kindly furnished a detailed Report. This

Report is annexed to the present Report as Appendix 2. At the same time I took the view that the general problem of the status of new names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch* (which had been raised by Dr. Osgood) and the particular problem of how to stabilise the names of the three genera of Carnivora from which parasites common to Man had been reported and for which names had been published by Oken in the *Lehrbuch* (which had been raised by the late Dr. Stiles) were of such importance that they should at once be brought to the attention of interested specialists, even though the war conditions then obtaining would inevitably render such a consultation only preliminary in character. I accordingly prepared a short note on this subject, which, however, owing to the long delays in printing inevitable at that time was not actually published until July 1945 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 112–113).

9. The general character of Oken's *Lehrbuch* is well illustrated by the analysis given by Dr. Jordan of the treatment accorded by Oken to what he called the first genus (1 Gattung) of his fifth tribe (5 Sippschaft). The genus is divided into six groups ; no Latin name is applied to the genus which has for its title only the German word " Muffer." Of the six groups into which the genus is divided four are headed both by a vernacular name and by a Latin noun, one is headed by a vernacular name (Stunk) and by two Latin nouns (*Mephitis* and *Viverra*), while the third group has only a vernacular name (Iltis). When we come to examine the terms applied to species (Arten), we find an equal lack of consistency of treatment. In the first group (*Meles*, Dachs) of the genus, each of the three species recognised is given an apparently binominal name, the first part of which consists of the word *Meles*. When we come to the second group (Stunk, *Mephitis*, *Viverra*), we find that each of the three species recognised is given a vernacular German name only (Zweistreifiger St. ; Fünfstreifiger St. ; Einstreifiger St.). Finally we have to note that each species is in turn subdivided, the appellations given to these subdivisions being of every possible variety, e.g. (*a*) vernacular names such as Teufelskind ; (*b*) a vernacular word followed by a Latin noun (which may be either a generic name or a univerbal Latin specific name in the manner of Gesner and other writers of the pre-1758 age), an example of this kind being provided by the second subdivision of the first species of the second group (Stunk) of the genus " Muffer ", where we find the entry " Yaguare, Zorills, Muffer " ; (*c*) a Latin binominal name such as *Gulo quitensis* (first species, third subdivision) ; and (*d*) a Latin trinominal name such as *Putorius americanus striatus* (second species, first subdivision).

10. The examples cited above show (1) that the system of nomenclature used by Oken in his *Lehrbuch* is utterly lacking in consistency ; (2) that it consists of the random use of Latin words and vernacular German words for the various categories recognised ; (3) that even if the terms applied to the genus (*Gattung*) and species (*Arten*) are disregarded, there is absolutely no consistency in the use of the terms employed to denote the units into which the various species are subdivided, it being apparently pure chance whether (i) a vernacular German word or (ii) such a word cited in combination with a Latin noun or (iii) a binominal combination of the Linnean type or (iv) a trinominal of the pre-1758 kind is used to denote the taxonomic unit in question.

11. In these circumstances I have no hesitation in reporting that in Volume **3** (Zoologie) of the *Lehrbuch der Naturesgeschichte* Oken did not apply " les

principes de la nomenclature binominale ". Accordingly, no name appearing in the above volume of the *Lehrbuch* acquired any availability under the *Règles* in virtue of having been so published.

12. I have further to add that, prior to the clarification of Proviso (*b*) to Articles 25 of the *Règles* by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948, the question of the availability of the names in Oken's *Lehrbuch* was examined by a number of authorities who rejected the claims advanced in favour of those names by Allen (J. A.) (1902), notwithstanding the fact that, before the Paris Congress, the presence in Proviso (*b*) of the ambiguous expression " nomenclature binaire " offered some scope for the defence of those names, which has disappeared now that that expression has been replaced by the unequivocal expression " nomenclature binominale." These authorities include : (1) Stiles (C. W.) & Orleman, 1927, *Hyg. Lab. Bull.* **145** ; (2) Cabrera (A.), 1943, *Ciencia* **4** (Nos. 4–5) ; Hershkowitz (P.), 1949, *J. Mammal.* **30** : 289–301. Of these authorities Dr. Cabrera, who is himself a member of the Commission, has kindly furnished me with a supplementary statement of his views, together with extracts from the salient portions of his paper of 1943. This statement is annexed to the present Report as Appendix 3.

III. On the effects of alternative treatments to be accorded to the names published in Volume 3 (Zoologie) of Oken's " Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte " on stability in nomenclature

13. The late Dr. Osgood pointed out that a number of names which first appeared in volume **3** (Zoologie) of Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* had come to be commonly accepted for well-known and important genera, instancing in this connection in the Class Mammalia the names *Citellus* Oken (for the very large group of ground squirrels of Asia and America), *Panthera* Oken (as a subgeneric name for the large cats, including the lion, the tiger, the leopard and others) and *Thos* Oken for the jackals. Dr. Osgood himself (as he made clear in his letter to me of 13th September 1944, an extract from which is appended to his application) was strongly opposed to the acceptance of Oken's names, but his references to the generic names cited above, coupled with the concluding remarks in his application, where he referred to the Commission's Plenary Powers, suggests that he had in mind that the Commission, when rejecting Oken's *Lehrbuch*, should make use of its Plenary Powers to preserve those of Oken's names which had taken deep root in the literature of mammalogy.

14. If such were in fact the ideas which Dr. Osgood had in mind, he only anticipated by a few years the view widely held and strongly expressed both within the Commission and in the general body of the Section on Nomenclature of the Paris and Copenhagen Congresses that means should be found for preventing decisions on purely technical nomenclatorial matters from having the effect of upsetting well-established names. It was indeed because the Paris Congress recognised that the declaration against the availability of non-binominal works that had hitherto been accepted (in whole or in part) on the ground that the nomenclature used therein, though not " binominal " was " binary " and therefore acceptable under the *Règles* might in some cases lead to the upsetting of well-known names that it took the action already described

(paragraph 5) for simplifying the procedure to be followed by the Commission when using its Plenary Powers for the purpose of validating generic names found to be invalid consequent upon the final rejection of the argument that the expression " nomenclature binaire " possessed a wider meaning than the expression " nomenclature binominale."

15. Oken's *Lehrbuch* being, in my opinion, a book which must be rejected as not satisfying the requirements of Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 (paragraph 11), it is necessary to consider whether any of the Oken names which, on the foregoing argument, are seen to be unavailable are nevertheless in such widespread use as to call for preservation under the Plenary Powers. This is a matter on which, for each group of the Animal Kingdom, only the specialists in that group are qualified to express an opinion. In the case of mammalogy it is already evident however that some authorities would be strongly opposed to the elimination of certain well-known Oken names now commonly used for important genera. Among these may be numbered first the late Dr. Osgood himself who would certainly have objected to the elimination of the names *Citellus*, *Panthera* and *Thos* (paragraph 13). Second, Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (Deputy Keeper, Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History), London), with whom and Dr. Edward Hindle (Scientific Director, Zoological Society of London) I had correspondence in 1946 and 1947 regarding the name *Pan* Oken as applied to the chimpanzee, has expressed himself as strongly opposed to the entire elimination of Oken's generic names for mammals. The relevant part of Mr. Morrison-Scott's letter is annexed to the present Report as Appendix 4. As will be there noted, Mr. Morrison-Scott points out that some of Oken's generic names have been accepted in such important works as Allen (G. M.), 1939, *Checklist of African Mammals* and Simpson (G. G.), 1945, *The Principles of Classification and a Classification of Mammals.*

16. Where a book fails to satisfy the requirements of Article 25, but the names in it are in general use or, if not all in use, can readily be assigned to their appropriate position in synonymy, it would be possible for the Commission to secure stability in the nomenclature in the group concerned by validating the whole book under its Plenary Powers. Accordingly, any name in such a book which was the oldest available name for a given genus would become the valid name for that genus, while names applicable to genera, for which there were older available names would disappear in synonymy. Theoretically, it would be possible for the Commission, if it so thought fit, to deal with Oken's *Lehrbuch* in this manner, that is, to validate it under the Plenary Powers. In fact, however, the adoption of this course would cause as much instability in nomenclature as would the disappearance of the Oken names, for the *Lehrbuch* would then need to be examined systematically, page by page, by specialists in all groups in the Animal Kingdom, since, although some Oken names have been brought into use, there are many more names included in the *Lehrbuch* which have been completely ignored and which it would then be necessary to take into account. This would be an extremely complicated and difficult task in view of the utter lack of consistency shown by Oken in the terminology applied by him to the species described in the *Lehrbuch*. This is well illustrated by the example given in the Report prepared by Dr. Jordan (Appendix 2). The virtual impossibility in many cases of determining whether a name was used as a generic name or was a

trivial name printed with a capital initial letter would lead to endless difficulty in determining the status of the names in question, and at times would be virtually certain to lead to such confusion that the use of the Plenary Powers would be necessary to suppress the name in question. Moreover, even if ultimately, with occasional help from the Commission, the generic names employed in Oken's work could be reduced to some kind of order, there would still remain the difficulty presented at the species level of the treatment to be accorded to the specific names used by Oken, for (as already explained) though many of these are binominal (e.g. *Gulo quitensis*, the name for one of the sub-units of Species 1 in Division " b " of the first genus of the fifth Sippschaft), many also are trinominals (e.g. *Putorius americanus striatus*, the term applied to the first sub-unit of the second species of the same Division of the genus referred to above). I conclude therefore that any action to be taken by the Commission to secure availability for those of Oken's generic names which are in common use should certainly not take the form of using the Plenary Powers to validate Oken's *Lehrbuch* as a whole, for that course would give rise to more numerous and more serious difficulties then would follow from the rejection of the *Lehrbuch* under the normal operation of the *Règles* and would be calculated to cause far greater instability and confusion in nomenclature.

17. If therefore express action is to be taken to prevent the confusion and instability which would follow the elimination in synonymy of certain of Oken's generic names, that action must, it is suggested, be selective in character and directed exclusively towards meeting the particular ends in view. Fortunately, it is possible in this matter to draw upon the precedent set by the Commission when dealing with the very similar problem presented by the generic names used for insects by Geoffroy (E. L.) in his celebrated *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, an admittedly non-binominal work published in 1762, many of the generic names published in which are however in general use. The problem presented by this book was considered by the Commission in Paris (Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusions 14–16) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 366–370) ,and the decision then taken is, I consider, extremely relevant to the consideration of the action to be taken in regard to the *Lehrbuch* of Oken. The action taken by the Commission as regards Geoffroy's *Histoire abrégée* was threefold in character: (1) the Commission declared that this work did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25 and therefore that names appearing in it were not available under the *Règles*; (2) the Commission at once used its Plenary Powers to validate one of the most important names thus found to be invalid (*Corixa* Geoffroy); (3) the Commission placed on record its view that " certain of the generic names published in the foregoing work, being in wide use, should certainly be validated in the interests of stability in nomenclature." In accordance with the last of these conclusions the Commission invited me, as the Secretary to the Commission, to confer with specialists in the various Orders of insects concerned, with a view to " the submission to the Commission " of " proposals for the validation, under the Plenary Powers, of such of the names concerned, the rejection of which would lead to instability or confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, so that, in the light of the statements so received, the Commission may validate such of the names concerned as may appear to it to be appropriate." The adoption of a similar procedure in the case of generic names

published by Oken in his *Lehrbuch*, when these are found to be in general use, would seem to me to be both highly appropriate and extremely desirable.

18. In addition to the names of the three genera of Carnivora published by Oken on which (as explained in paragraph 8 above) there is an outstanding application by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles, the Commission has had before it for some time an application (Z.N.(S.)261) submitted by Professor Harold Kirby (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) for the validation, under the Plenary Powers, of the generic name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora). In agreement with Professor Kirby, the publication of this application was deferred until it could be published at the same time as the present Report. It is accordingly now published immediately after the present Report.

19. In March 1952 I issued a general appeal to specialists to furnish statements of their views on the question of the availability of names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch* and at the same time to furnish particulars of any generic names published by Oken currently in use in their respective groups which, in their opinion, ought to be preserved, if the Commission were to rule that in his *Lehrbuch* Oken did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25 and therefore that no name published in that work acquired the status of availability in virtue of having been so published (Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 195-196). None of the specialists who responded to the foregoing appeal considered that Oken's *Lehrbuch* was a nomenclatorially available work. A number of these specialists, however, furnished particulars relating to individual Oken names in common use for genera in their own groups which they recommended should be validated under the Plenary Powers, in order to prevent the disturbance and confusion in nomenclature which would otherwise be inevitable. These applications will be published in the *Bulletin* as soon as possible.

Summary of Conclusions

20. In the light of the evidence examined, and of the considerations advanced in the present Report, I now summarise, as follows, the conclusions which I have formed on the subject of the availability of the names published in the period 1815–1816 in Volume **3** (Zoologie) of Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* ;—

(1) In Volume **3** (Zoologie) of the *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* which was published in the period 1815–1816, Oken did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of the *Règles*, as clarified by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 (paragraphs 9–10).

(2) In consequence of (1) above, no name published by Oken in the foregoing work acquired any status in zoological nomenclature in virtue of having been so published (paragraph 11).

(3) In some groups of the Animal Kingdom, e.g. in mammalogy, certain generic names are commonly accepted with priority from Oken's *Lehrbuch*. In some cases genera to which these names are applied are well known and of wide distribution. The elimination of the Oken names for these genera would lead to instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the groups concerned (paragraphs 13–15).

(4) Availability for the Oken generic names now in common use could be provided by the use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers to render Volume **3** of Oken's *Lehrbuch* available under the *Règles* and thus to validate *en bloc* the new names published in that book. The adoption of this course in the case of Oken's *Lehrbuch* would however be open to strong objection, for the nomenclature employed by Oken in that work is so confused that the grant of availability to that work as a whole would be bound to give rise to numerous and serious difficulties by reason of the large number of names introduced by Oken which have hitherto been ignored (paragraph 16).

(5) Availability could be secured for such of Oken's generic names as are in common use and the disappearance of which in synonymy would give rise to instability and confusion by the selective use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers, in the same way that the Commission has already decided to use those powers in relation to the parallel case of the generic names published in 1762 by Geoffroy (E. L.) in his *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*. This is the course which I recommend should now be taken (paragraph 17).

FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Secretariat of the Commission :

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

9th March, 1954.

APPENDIX 1

APPLICATION RELATING TO THE STATUS OF THE NAMES IN OKEN'S "LEHRBUCH DER NATURGESCHICHTE" SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE BY DR. WILFRED H. OSGOOD IN MAY 1944

Are the names in Oken, 1815-1816, "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte" 3 (Zoologie), available under the Règles?

By WILFRED H. OSGOOD
(*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

Oken's names were especially brought to attention by J. A. Allen in 1902 (*Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.* **16**: 373-379). At this time Allen said: "Oken was almost as erratic and irregular in nomenclatorial matters as was Zimmermann in his *Specimen Zoologiae Geographicae*[1] published in 1777, but in some respects is less satisfactory, since he failed to cite authorities for the names used, and gave no reference to his sources of information. Both diagnosed generic, subgeneric and other groups, as well as species, under either vernacular or systematic names, as seemed to please their fancy, and employed the names given by previous authors as these authors used them, regardless of whether the generic portion of the name conformed or not to the genus to which they assigned the species. Yet they each had a 'system',—sadly defective, however, when tried by the nomenclatorial usages of today."

Allen then discussed a number of Oken's generic and specific names of mammals which might be adopted for use instead of those current at the time. Nowhere does he say that they must be used and his entire paper is factual rather than argumentative, his attitude being that of suspended judgment rather than conviction. In other words, his paper is that of a reporter rather than an advocate and what he says essentially is that, if Oken's names are acceptable, then certain changes are necessary.

Nevertheless, the Oken names have been accepted especially by British and American mammalogists and have been in general use for more than forty years. Among them are some of wide use not only in taxonomic but in general literature for some of the best known animals in the world. Examples are *Citellus* Oken, which replaced *Spermophilus* Cuvier for the very large group of ground squirrels of Asia and America, including species concerned in the transmission of disease and therefore dealt with in medical literature; *Panthera* Oken, which has been adopted as a genus or subgenus for the larger cats including the lion, tiger, leopard and some others; and *Thos* Oken for the jackals.

[1]The *Specimen Zoologiae* of Zimmermann has since been rejected by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature as a work which does not comply with the requirements of Article 25. Proviso (*b*). See *Opinion* 257.

In 1904 (*S.B. Ges. naturf. Fr. Berlin* **1904** : 55), only two years after Allen's paper, the German mammalogist Matschie demurred by saying : " Die in Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* verwendeten Bezeichnungen dürfen deshalb nicht gebraucht werden, weil die Grundsätze der binaren Nomenklatur in diesem Buche nicht befolgt sind."

In 1927 Stiles and Orlemann (*Bull. U.S. hyg. Lab.* **145** : 29), in dealing with the Primates, said of Oken's work : " From our viewpoint the nomenclature used by Oken, 1816, pp. 1223–1232, is not in harmony with International Rules, is neither consistently binary nor consistently binominal, hence is not available under the Law of Priority."

In 1932 (*Trab. Mus. Cienc. nat.*, Madrid (Zool.) **57** : 106), Cabrera referred to Oken saying : " este autor no siguió la verdadera nomenclatura binaria, y por consiguiente sus nombres no deben admitirse." (Since, this author has consistently refused to recognise Oken's names and recently has issued a detailed defence of his position (1943, *Ciencia*, Mexico **4** : 108–111).

The fact remains that Oken's names have attained wide currency in spite of expressed objection to them. They seem to be similar to the names of Gronovius, which were accepted by the Commission under *Opinion* 20 and later rejected by exercise of Plenary Power under *Opinion* 89. In fact it might well be argued that they are even less deserving than the names of Gronovius. Regardless of interpretation of the Code, a ruling on them appears to be necessary, since it is now a question of " greater confusion than uniformity " apparently subject only to the exercise of the Plenary Power.[2]

Postscript (extract from a letter, dated 13th September 1944, to the Secretary to the Commission) : In regard to Oken's *Lehrbuch*, I would prefer to see it entirely suppressed. Allen, who first uncovered it and who has been followed considerably, did not make a very good case for it, and later authors, including both Stiles and Stejneger, I believe, have argued that it does not conform to the Code.

[2] It should be noted that *Opinion* 20 was rendered at a date prior to the grant to the International Commission of Plenary Powers to suspend the rules in certain cases. That *Opinion*, therefore, dealt only with the sole question, with which the International Commission was then empowered to deal, namely the Interpretation of the Code, the question then submitted being whether Gronovius in 1763, *Zoophylacium*, had " applied the principles of binary nomenclature " as required by proviso (b) to Article 25 of the International Code. The question dealt with in *Opinion* 89 is entirely different from that dealt with in *Opinion* 20, since *Opinion* 89 is not concerned in any way with the interpretation of the Code but with the question whether or not the Plenary Powers conferred upon the International Commission at Monaco in 1913 should or should not be used to suppress Gronovius, 1763, *Zoophylacium*, and certain other works.

APPENDIX 2

On the system of classification used by Oken (L.) in his "Lehrbuch der Naturegeschichte" of 1816

By KARL JORDAN, Ph.D., F.R.S.
(*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring*)

(Extract from a letter dated 10th June 1944, from Dr. Karl Jordan (then President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) to the Secretary to the Commission)

In order to understand Oken's classification and nomenclature, two main points must be kept in mind. (1) Animals were created according to a definite plan : a tribe (which he calls *Sippschaft*) consists of four genera in every family (Oken's *Zunft*) ; the number of species in each genus varies. Often there are so many kinds known that Oken subdivides the genus concerned. These divisions and subdivisions of a *Gattung* are marked by letters (e.g. the letters "*a*," "*b*," "*c*," etc.). These are usually followed by one or more Latin names. The classification and nomenclature used are complicated. (2) Apart from the part relating to European animals, Oken's *Lehrbuch* is mainly a compilation. When uncertain about the systematic position of an animal, Oken often refers to the same animal in different places and gives more than one Latin name for it. The names so given are usually taken from the literature. He cites no authors' names and gives no bibliographical references for the Latin names cited. At the end of the volume he gives a short bibliography.

The nature of Oken's system of classification may be illustrated by an example. I therefore give below his classification for the first genus of his fifth tribe (5 *Sippschaft*, 1 *Gattung*), from which I have omitted his descriptions.

Classification used by Oken for the first genus of his fifth tribe

5. Sippschaft

1. Gattung. Muffer [The German names—often spaced—are mostly Oken's invention.]
   a. Dächse
   a. Meles, Dachs ;
      1. Art. *M. vulgaris, Ursus Meles, Taxus*, gen. D., Gräving ;
      2. Art. *M. americana, Ursus labradorius ;*
      3. Art. *M. indica ;*
         Der lang bekannte *Meles indicus* ist augenscheinlich *Galeopithecus !*
   b. Stunk, *Mephitis. Viverra*, Stinthier, Muffer ;
      1. Art. Zweistreifiger St. [No Latin name cited]
         a. Teufelskind oder Stinkthier (*Viv. Mephitis*) ;
         b. Yaguara, *Zorilla*, Muffer von Chili ;
            Here probably a Muffer from Chili, but the white on frons and occiput broader, more probably Grunzer or Blaser at Magellan's Strait, Stinkfüchse, *Putorius americanus*. Stinkthier in Luisiana, Schweitzer, Ortohula, Teufelskind and *Chinche*. (translation)

c. Gulo quitensis, Atok oder Zorra (Fuchs) ;
As the Atok has been placed in *Gulo*, one should expect that its dentition would be the same ; but we doubt it. (translation)

2. Art. Fünfstreifiger St. ; [no Latin name cited]
a. Putorius americanus striatus (*Viv. Putorius*) ;
At the end of the description of colour and habits there occurs—over the page—the name *Putorius americanus striatus* (int'd K.J.)
b. [Oken made no entry under this sub-item. int'd K.J.]
c. Conepate (*Viv. Putorius*) ; [sei the equivalent of the Latin *scu* K.J.] *Coneptl*, amerik. Iltis gestreiften.

3. Art. Einstreifiger St. ; [no Latin name cited]
a. Cinche (*Viv. Mephitis*) ; sei Yzquiepatl (schlechthin) ;
b. Mapurito (*Viv. Mapurito*) ; . . . sei *Viverra Putorius*
[The word " Mapurito " is here used as a specific name. int'd K.J.]

c. Iltis St.
1. Art. Geflekter St. ; [no Latin name cited]
a. Mapurito oder *Mafutiliqui* (*Viv. Zorilla*) ; [The word " Mapurito " is here used as a vernacular name. int'd K.J.]
[If here *Zorilla ?* Query *Zorinna* or *Anna ?* (transl.)]
b. Chingha (*Viverra Chingha*) ;
c. Zorille ; sei eine mit *Mafutiliqui* und *Ortohula*

d. Gräving, *Grison :* [The word " Gräving " is slightly spaced. K.J.]
1. Art. Zügel G. ; [no Latin name cited]
a. Chinche (*Viv. vittata*) ; Sei Maikal oder Yagiane.—
b. Viverra vittata, Grison :
Mustela gujanensis, Foine von Güana ;
Huron minor, Martes Grison :
[*Note :* The above are not *vittata* but are two additional distinct species, each with its own description. int'd. K.J.]
Perhaps here Yzquiepatl (*Viv. Vulpecula*), Teufelskind and Chinche from Brazil. *Grison* (*Viv. vittata*) and *Galera* belong together ?, the former probably here. (translation)

e. Schnopp, *Tayra :*
1. Art. Gelbkehliger Sch. ; [no Latin name cited]
a. Mustela barbara, Tayra oder grose Wiesel ;
Einerlei Gr. Marder von Güana, *Must. poliocephalus.*
b. M. lanata, kl. *Foina* von Güana ;
c. Mustela canadensis, Pekan ;
There are three animals in Paragay similar to the marten, pine marten and polecat, but larger . . . They are *Huron minor, major*, Yaguare ; *Huron major* (*Furo* m.) ; *Martes Tayra* ; . . . Is *Mustela barbara* different ? It seems to be *Ichneumon de Yzquiepatl* (*Viv. Quasja*). Pekan (*Must. canadens.*), kleine *Foina* von Güana (*Must. lanata*), Tayra (*M. barbara*). (translation)

2. Art. Schwarzer Sch. [no Latin name cited]
a. Yzquiepatl, seu Vulpecula quae Maizium torrefactum semulatur colore (*Viv. Vulpecula*) ;

There are two other small foxes of this sort. One is generally called *Yzquiepatl* . . . The other is called Conepatl seu *Vulpecula puerilis*, . . . (translation)

b. Stinkthier, (*Viv. Putorius*)

3. Art. Brauner Sch. ;

Ichneumon de Izquiepatl (*Viv. Quasja*)

One could put *Coase* here if anteriorly it has five toes. (translation)

f. Järf, *Gulo, Ursus ;*

1. Art. *G. vulgaris, Urs. Gulo, Hyaena, Glouton, Rosomak*, Filfrass (Rahmfrass), Schnopp, gem. J. ;

APPENDIX 3

On the question of the status of names in Oken, 1815-1816, "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte" 3 (Zoologie)

By ANGEL CABRERA
(*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*)

(Extract from a letter dated 20th July 1950 from Dr. Cabrera to the Secretary to the Commission)

I have read very attentively the fourth volume of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The question about the names in Oken's *Lehrbuch* interests me very much. I received some time ago your request regarding my paper on this subject. but unfortunately I had not myself a copy of this paper and was therefore forced to ask for one from Mexico, where it was published seven years ago (in *Ciencia* **4** (Nos. 4-5) published on 20th October 1943).

My reasons for rejecting Oken's names are similar in every way to those advanced by Hershkowitz in 1949 (*J. Mammal.* **30**: 289-301). The following is a translation of a part of my paper :—

> Though this book [Oken's *Lehrbuch*] was published in 1816, naturalists in general ignored Oken's names until 1902, when J. A. Allen gave a list of those which, in his opinion, ought to be accepted in Mammalogy. He did not do so, however, without giving the warning that Oken was "erratic and irregular in nomenclatorial matters" and that his manner of naming animals was "sadly defective when tried by the nomenclatorial uses of today." From that date however North American zoologists began to use these names, and their example was soon followed by the Europeans. A noteworthy exception was Paul Matschie (1904), who rejected them on the ground that Oken never followed the true binary nomenclature, a very important opinion, coming, as it did, from a fellow-countryman of the author under criticism. Many years afterwards, when studying the nomenclature of the apes, Stiles and Orleman (1927) expressed the same views. . . . As said by Stiles and Orleman, the author of a book or publication must be "consistently binary and consistently binominal" in order that the names in his book may be accepted. Indeed, if an author does not practise binary and binominal nomenclature, it would be absurd to accept one or two of his names, merely because they are accidentally formed of two words. This being so, it is not possible to consider Oken as an author applying the principles of binary nomenclature in his *Lehrbuch*. . . . Some of Oken's genera (Gattungen) have a name composed of two words in violation of the principle established by Linnaeus and now embodied in Article 8 of the *Règles*. Among the genera of fishes, there is one named "*Regalecus lanceolatus*" and another has as its name "*Lepidopus goranensis*". Many of the genera have not even a technical name,

being cited only under the vernacular German name, such as "Schlenderschwanz" among reptiles and "Muffer" among mammals. In the genus "*Lepidopus goranensis*" there is found a species named "*Botrichthys sinensis*", whereas the name of another is "*Botrichthoides oculatus*." The genus of reptiles "Schlenderschwanz" includes the species "*Stellio Lacerta caudiverbera*," "*Stellio fimbriatus*" and "*Stellio tetradactylus*," while later another genus is named *Stellio* and contains other different species. . . . Oken's specific names are frequently binomial, but many of them are trinomial and even plurinomial. Thus, the orang outang appears as "*Faunus indicus, rufus.*" If we do not see here a trinomial denomination, we shall be forced to regard this expression not as a name at all, but as an abbreviated description such as those used by Seba, Brisson, etc. In the genus *Cercopithecus*, we find similar instances; among its species there is a "*Cercopithecus angolensis major*," a "*Cercopithecus angolensis alius*" and a "*Simia nigra magnitudinis mediae.*"

Other examples given in my paper are the same as those pointed out by Hershkowitz. To sum up, I conclude by saying that Oken's nomenclature "is merely an irregular mixture of generic names, sometimes in Latin and sometimes in German, indistinctly composed of one or of two words, with specific names as often binomial as uninomial or polynomial. It is impossible, in my opinion, to use the names belonging to such a system of nomenclature, if we reject those given by Frisch, Gronow or Catesby. To accept these names as valid, in clear breach of the principles of Article 25 of the *Règles Internationales*, would be to declare the futility of the *Règles* themselves or, at least, to agree with those that ignore them".

APPENDIX 4

On the question of the use of generic names published in Oken's "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte"

(Extract from a letter, dated 18th January 1947, from Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott, Deputy Keeper, Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History) to the Secretary to the Commission)

I think that the elimination of Oken's *Lehrbuch* would be a very retrograde step, so far as mammals are concerned. At last we are getting some sort of order into things. Works like Allen (1939) *Checklist of African Mammals* and Simpson (1945) *The Principles of Classification and a Classification of Mammals* are the foundations on which we now build and there is a growing feeling among mammalogists that the foundations should not be disturbed. The need for stability in order to take stock of the mass of undigested knowledge overrides the following of rules for the sake of pedantic uniformity—or that is the way I see it.

Both Allen and Simpson use Oken's names—not merely *Pan* but *Panthera*, *Genetta*, etc,. and it would be crazy to eliminate these names.

ON THE NEED FOR VALIDATING THE NAME " STENTOR " OKEN, 1815 (CLASS CILIOPHORA) FOR USE IN ITS ACCUSTOMED SENSE

By HAROLD KIRBY
(*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)261)

Several species of well-known ciliates have for more than a century usually been placed in the genus *Stentor*, and because of the particular value of these ciliates for research and in class instruction, as well as the frequency with which they come to the attention of microscopists, there is a large literature under the name *Stentor*. The name has not yet been placed in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. Examination of the nomenclatural status of the genus has shown that several points of confusion, hitherto usually ignored, must be cleared up. The name for the genus and its type species should be decisively established as soon as possible by appropriate action by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The first record of observation of ciliates now included in *Stentor* was read by Abraham Trembley to the Royal Society of London in 1744 and was published in 1745 in the *Philosophical Transactions*, **43** : 180 ff. He reported having seen in fresh water animalcula which De Réaumur judged to belong to the general class of Polypi. Part of the paper is devoted to an account of clustering Polypi, which Trembley stated were named by De Réaumur " les Polypes en bouquet " ; these were colonial vorticellids, probably *Zoothamnium*. Trembley also wrote of small Polypi of a different sort from those that are found in clusters, which De Réaumur thought proper to distinguish by the name of Tunnel-like Polypi. He gave a sufficiently informative account of these animalcula and their manner of division so that it is evident that he dealt with *Stentor*. He reported being acquainted with three species of these Polypi, which are respectively green, blue, and white.

In *Employment for the Microscope* (1753, pp. 330-334) Henry Baker wrote of Funnel-Animals which he found attached to a parcel of snail's eggs, and he quoted Trembley's account, stating in a footnote that he was pleased to find that de Réaumur and Trembley had ideas of the creature so nearly like his own. He gave a figure (pl. 13, fig. 1) which evidently depicts a species of the genus known later as *Stentor*, though he supplied no sufficient information by means of which one could identify it with *St. polymorphus*, as did Ehrenberg (1838, *Infusionsth.* : 263).

Figures of an organism of this group were published in 1755 by Rosel von Rosenhof (*Insectenbelust.*, **3** : pl. 94, figs. 7, 8) who discussed it in the text (: 585) under the name " der schallemeynähnliche Affterpolyp." The figures represent one of the colorless species, which Ehrenberg (1838, *Infusionsth.* : 262) considered to be the one that he later named *St. müllери* ; but the species represented by Rösel cannot actually be identified.

The scientific name first given to a ciliate that now belongs to the genus *Stentor* was *Hydra stentoria* Linnaeus (1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 817). The name was applied to the representation of the organism by Rösel. Under the name, Linnaeus referred to four of Rösel's figures (*Insectenbel.*, **3** : pl. 94, figs. 5, 6, 7, 8). Figures 5 and 6 depict a rotifer ; Ehrenberg (1838, *Infusionsth.* : 404) included a reference to them in the synonymy of *Lacinularis socialis*. Thus the name given by Linnaeus in 1758 was applied both to a rotifer and the ciliate.

Linnaeus later (1767, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1** : 1321) published an emendation of the specific name as *stentorea*, and under *H. stentorea* referred to an extended list of references : the accounts by Trembley and Baker and the latter's figure which I have mentioned : Rösel's figs. 7 and 8 (not 5 and 6) ; references by Ledermuller and by Pallas. Linnaeus (1767) referred to Rösel's figures 5 and 6 under *Hydra socialis*. He had evidently restricted his concept of *H. stentorea* so far as the original reference of 1758 was concerned, to Rösel's figures that actually represented the ciliate. Pallas (1766) used the name *Brachionus stentoreus*, with varieties *alba*, *viridis*, and *caeruleus* ; he removed the stentorid of Linnaeus to that genus, along with some rotifers and vorticellids.

O. F. Müller, recognising that the ciliate dealt with by Linnaeus could not be put in the genera *Hydra* or *Brachionus*, included it in *Vorticella*. Under *Vorticella stentorea* (1773, *Verm. terrest. fluviat.* : 111), he quoted the description of *Hydra stentorea* by Linnaeus. In the genus he also treated of several species that were in Linnaeus's genus *Vorticella*, together with a heterogeneous assemblage of ciliates and some rotifers. In this work Müller dealt with two other stentorid ciliates, which he named *Vorticella nigra* (*op. cit.* : 96) and *V. polymorpha* (*op. cit.* : 98). Later (1786, *Animalc. Inf.* : 262) he described a third species, *Vorticella multiformis*. A peritrich dealt with in the latter work is *Vorticella versatilis* (*op. cit.* : 281, pl. 39, figs. 14-17). In that peritrich individuals occur abundantly in the periphery of large, gelatinous masses.

Vorticella stentorea was included in the genus *Linza* Schrank, 1802, by Schrank (1802, 1803). This genus contained the colonial peritrich, then widely known as *Ulva pruniformis*, which was Müller's *Vorticella versatilis*, and of which the currently used name is *Ophrydium versatile* ; Müller's *Vorticella flosculosa* (1786, *Animalc. Inf.* : 304, pl. 43, figs. 16-20), which is the colonial rotifer known later as *Lacinularia socialis* ; and Müller's *Vorticella socialis* (*op. cit.* : 304, pl. 43, figs. 13-15), which is in part also *Lacinularia socialis*. Schrank's genus *Linza* was a complex of a peritrich, a rotifer, and a stentorid ciliate. Neave (*Nomenclator Zoologicus*) lists *Linza* as in Rotifera.

The stentorids that had been named by Müller (1786) *Vorticella nigra* and *V. polymorpha* were placed by Schrank (1803) in the genus *Ecclissa*, as *E. nigra* and *E. viridis*, along with various species of Müller's *Vorticella*.

Bütschli (1889 in Bronn, *Klass. Ord. Thierreiches*, **1** : 1728) listed *Ecclissa* and *Linza* pp. Schrank in the synonymy of *Stentor*. Stein (1876, *Organ. Inf. fusionsth.* : 221) had written of the injustice of the neglect suffered by Schrank's names, but recognised the futility of attempting to revive one or the other of

them for the stentorid ciliates. The history of those names is complicated and obscure, and they have never come into use. To complicate the matter still further, I find that Lamouroux *et. al.* (1824, *Hist. nat. Zooph.*, **2** : 291) refer to the genus *Ecclissa* established by Ocken (*sic*) for vorticellids, and to *Linze*, a genus established by Guettard in sponges. Also there is *Eclissa* Modeer (*A.*), 1790, emended in Agassiz (1842-46, *Nomenclator Zoologicus*) to *Ecclissa* Modeer, in Vorticellina.

These names are associated with the older history of the nomenclature of stentorid ciliates, and so have been discussed, but they are not necessarily important in relation to the present problem. The type of *Linza* Schrank may be considered to be *Vorticella flosculosa* Müller, which is the rotifer *Lacinularia socialis* : and that of *Ecclissa* Schrank may be considered to be one of the peritrichs he included in it. Thus these problems are removed to other groups than that which now concerns us, though it would be well if the Commission used its Plenary Powers to suppress the names *Linza* Schrank and *Ecclissa* Schrank, as well as *Eclissa* Modeer.

Oken (1815, *Lehrb. Naturgesch.*, Theil **3**, Abt. 1 : 45) applied the name *Stentor* to the same group of organisms as that in Schrank's genus *Linza*, though he did not refer to that fact. In the genus he gave three species : *St. solitarius* Oken, 1815 (*Vorticella stentorea* renamed) ; *St. socialis*, which was the rotifer *Lacinularia socialis* ; and *St. pruniformis* otherwise known as *Ulva pruniformis* or *Linza pruniformis* (*Ophrydium versatile*). Oken (1815) also listed the genus *Ecclissa*, with *E. nigra* (*Vorticella nigra*) and *E. viridis* (*Vorticella viridis*) as the species. Oken had distributed the species within the group we now know as *Stentor* into two genera, *Ecclissa* in his listing containing only members of that group, *Stentor* containing a heterogeneous assemblage of organisms, one of which belonged to the group in which we are presently interested.

The name *Stentor* Oken, 1815, was preoccupied. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire (1812, *Ann. Mus. Nat. Hist.* **19** : 107) had proposed the name *Stentor* for a genus of South American monkeys, listing six species. For that group of howling monkeys, however, two generic names had already been supplied. *Stentor* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1812, is antedated by *Alouatta* Lacépède, 1799, and by *Mycetes* Illiger, 1811 (Palmer, 1904, *Index generum mammalium*, *North Am. Fauna*, No. 23). Consequently, *Stentor* has never been in use among mammalogists, and is often neglected even as a synonym.

A comparable case is that of *Necator* Stiles, 1903, which was dealt with by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the 7th Meeting in Paris, July, 1948 (*Off. Record Proceedings* : 301-302)[1]. It was found by Mr. Hemming that the above generic name is a junior homonym of *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896, an emendation of *Nicator*, Finsch and Hartlaub, 1870, a genus in the Class Aves. *Necator* has not been in use by ornithologists, *Nicator* having always been the name by which the genus is known. At this meeting, the Commission used its Plenary Powers to suppress *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896, and to validate the generic name *Necator* Stiles, 1903.

[1] See *Opinion* 201 (1954, *Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 267-274).

Another aspect of this problem is its relation to a matter that came to the attention of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its 13th Meeting in Paris, July, 1948 (*Off. Record Proceedings* : 365-366). It concerned a proposal that had been made by Stiles for addition to the *Official List of Generic Names* of three genera of Carnivora first published by Oken (1815-16) in his *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, and an application by Osgood for a ruling on the question of availability of names first published in Oken's *Lehrbuch*. The Commission agreed to take into consideration as soon as possible the question of a ruling on the availability of Oken's names, and to defer a decision on the application by Stiles for addition of three of Oken's genera of Carnivora to the *Official List* until there had been a decision on the availability of those names.

Since *Stentor* Oken, 1915, is a name also published in the *Lehrbuch* in question, its placement in the *Official List of Generic Names* is subject to the same consideration.

Several other names have been proposed for the ciliates of this generic group. Bory (1824, Lamouroux, Bory de Saint-Vincent, et Eud. Deslongchamps, *Enc. méth., Hist. nat. Zooph.*, **2** : 533, 697) gave the name *Stentorina* to a genus which included the stentorids which Müller had grouped in *Vorticella : V. polymorpha*, *V. nigra*, and *V. multiformis*. This was the first bringing together of these species into a single independent genus. Bory's concept of their relationship was obviously far superior to that of Oken. Bory did, however, carry on an error that others had made before him, in giving the names *Stentorina Roëselii* and *S. biloba* to a rotifer, the one later known as *Lacinularia socialis*.

The generic name *Tubaria* was proposed by Thienemann (1828, *Lehrbuch Zool.* : 12), since the name *Stentor* had been used for a genus of apes by Geoffroy. He gave the species name *T. viridis*, which according to Ehrenberg (1838) is *Stentor polymorphus*. I have not been able to refer to Thienemann's book, but the name has no significance for the present nomenclatural problem.

Reichenbach (1828, *Zoologie* in *Allg. Taschenb. Naturw.*, Th. **5**, 1 : 95) substituted the name *Stentorella* for *Stentor* Ok. *non* Geoffr. He did not refer to any species. This name was neglected for more than a century, not even being included in nomenclatural indices (Agassiz, 1842-6 ; Sherborn, 1902). Recently Bhatia (1936, *Fauna Br. Ind., Prot : Ciliophora :* 234) noted preoccupation of *Stentor* for a genus of Mammalia and adopted instead *Stentorella* Reichenbach. Bhatia neglected the prior claim of *Stentorina*, if substitution is to be made, and his proposal to use *Stentorella* is invalid.

Another problem exists in regard to identification of the type species of *Stentor* Oken, 1815. When proposed, it contained only the one heterotrich *St. solitarius* Oken, 1815, along with the peritrich and rotifer. *St. solitarius* is a name supplied as equivalent to *Vorticella stentorea* Müller, 1773, so stated by Oken. It is also equivalent to *Hydra stentoria* Linnaeus, 1758. The trail of references occurring in the different authors' works goes back to Linnaeus.

But the same or equivalent names were not necessarily applied to the same organisms, and species identification of the ciliates as named and described by these authors is not possible.

Ehrenberg (1832, *Abh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin*, **1831** : 99) substituted the name *Stentor mülleri* E. for *Vorticella stentorea* Müller. A recognisable figure of *Stentor mülleri* was published by Ehrenberg (1837, *op. cit.* **1835** : pl. 1, fig. 16). A full, illustrated account of the species was provided by Ehrenberg (1838, *Infusionsth.* : 262). In that work Ehrenberg listed *Stentorina mülleri* Bory de Saint-Vincent, 1824 in the synonymy of *Stentor mülleri*. I have been unable to find that Bory used that name, though he did give *Stentorina stentorea* for Müller's *Vorticella stentorea*, a fact that Ehrenberg did not refer to in the synonymy in discussion.

Ehrenberg (1832, *op. cit.* : 99) stated that *Stentor mülleri* was *Vorticella stentorea* Müller, and in 1838 he listed *St. solitarius* Oken in the synonymy of *St. mülleri*. *St. solitarius* is the type, being the only ciliate in Oken's genus *Stentor* at the time it was proposed. Prior to Ehrenberg's accounts of 1832, 1837, and especially 1838 it is impossible to tell what species of colourless stentorids are referred to by the names that were given. The description of *Stentor mülleri* by Ehrenberg can, as Mr. Hemming suggested, be designated by the Commission as that to be accepted for the nominal type species of *Stentor* Oken, 1815. Since 1830 the specific names of this nominal species, *solitarium* Oken or the older *stentoria* or *stentorea*, have not been in use. It would be undesirable to revive them. The Commission should consider suppressing those specific names and designating the type species of *Stentor* as *St. mulleri* Ehrenberg, 1832 (*Abh. Konig Ak. Wiss. Berlin*, **1831** : 99).

There is not complete agreement about the taxonomic status of *Stentor mülleri*. Stein (1867, *Org. Infusionsth.* Abt. **2** : 223, 229) maintained that *St. mülleri* is no more than a colourless form of *St. polymorphus* (*i.e.*, without zoochlorellæ), and placed (: 247) *Hydra stentorea* L., 1758 ; *Vorticella stentorea* Müller, 1773 ; *Stentor solitarius* Oken, 1815 ; and *Stentorina stentorea* Bory, 1824 in the synonymy of *Stentor Roëselii* Ehrbg. This species like *St. mülleri* is colourless and may occur in a gelatinous lorica. *Stentor mülleri* is recognised, however, in recent literature in protozoology.

In his list of proposed *Nomina Conservanda* Apstein (1915, *Sitzungsber. Gesell. Naturf. Freunde Berlin* **1915** : 123) included *Stentor* Oken, 1815, and gave as the representative species (" eine art gennant, für welche die Gattung erhalten bleiben soll ") *polymorphus* Müll., 1773. However, under Article 30, that species is excluded as the type species of *Stentor*, since it was not included under the generic name at the time of publication.

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is faced with a problem in considering the placing of the name of this important ciliate genus on the *Official List of Generic Names*. If it is decided that new names in Oken's *Lehrbuch* are available, *Stentor* Oken, 1815, may be preserved by suppression of *Stentor* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1812. If it is decided that the new names in

Oken's *Lehrbuch* are not available, the problem of selecting a name for these ciliates must be considered further. Perhaps *Stentorina* Bory de Saint-Vincent, 1824, could be adopted, with the type species *Vorticella polymorpha* Müller, 1773. A change of so well-known and long used a generic name as *Stentor* should be avoided if possible.

References

Apstein, C., 1915. Nomina conservanda. *Sitzungsbericht der Gesellschaft naturforschender Freunde zu Berlin*, **1915** : 119-202.

Baker, Henry, 1753.. *Employment for the microscope*. (London.)

Bhatia, B. L., 1936. Protozoa : Ciliophora. *The fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma*. (London, Taylor & Francis.)

Bory de Saint-Vincent, J. B., 1824. Microscopiques *in* Lamouroux, Bory de Saint-Vincent, et Eud. Deslongchamps : Histoire naturelle des zoophytes, ou animaux rayonnes, pp. 515-543. *Encyclopedie Méthodique*. (Paris.)

Bory de Saint-Vincent, J. B., 1824. Stentorine ; *Stentorina in* Lamouroux, Bory de Saint-Vincent, et Eud. Deslongchamps : Histoire naturelle des zoophytes, ou animaux rayonnés, pp. 697-700. *Encyclopédie Méthodique*. (Paris.)

Ehrenberg, C. G., 1832. Uber die Entwickelung und Lebensdauer der Infusionsthiere ; nebst ferneren Beitragen zu einer Vergleichung ihrer organischen Systeme. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, **1831** : 1-154.

Ehrenberg, C. G., 1837. Zusätze zur Erkenntnis grosser organischer Ausbildung in den kleinsten thierischen Organismen. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, **1835** : 151-180.

Ehrenberg, C. G., 1838. *Die Infusionsthierchen als vollkommene Organismen*. (Leipzig, Leopold Voss.)

Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, I., 1812. Tableau des Quadrumanes, ou des Animaux composant le premier Ordre de la Classe des Mammifères. *Annales du Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle*, **19** : 85-122.

Ledermuller, M. F., 1764. *Amusement mocroscopique tant pour l'esprit, que pour les yeux*. (Nuremberg.)

Linnaeus, C., 1758. *Systema Naturae, edition decima*, Tomus I. (Holmiae.)

Linné, Caroli A., 1767. *Systema Naturae*, ed. duodecima. (Holmiae.)

Müller, O. F., 1773. *Vermium terrestrium et fluviatilium*. (Hauniae et Lipsiae.)

Müller, O. F., 1786. *Animalcula infusoria fluviatilia et marina.* (Hauniae.)

Oken, L., 1815. *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte.* Dritter Theil. Zoologique. Erste Abth. Fleischlose Thiere. (Jena, Schmid und Com.)

Reichenbach, L., 1828. Zoologie oder Naturgeschichte des Tierreichs. *Erstes Bd. in Allgemeine Taschenbibliothek der Naturwissenschaften*, fünfter Th. (Dresden, Hilschersche Buchh.)

Rösel von Rosenhof, A. J., 1755. *Der monatlich-herausgegebenen Insecten-Belustigung.* **3** : 585-596. Vier fünf und Sechs und Neunzigste Supplementstabelle. Der gesellige, keulenförmige Affterpolyp. Tab. XCIV, XCV und XCVI.

Schrank, F. von P. von., 1802. *Briefe naturhistorische, physikalische und ökonomische Inhalts an Nau.* (Erlangen.)

Schrank, F. von P. von., 1803. *Fauna boica.* **30**. 2. (Nürnberg.)

Sherborn, C. D., 1931. *Index Animalium*, pt. 25. (London, British Museum.)

Stein, F., 1867. *Der Organismus der Infusionsthiere.* II. Abthteilung. (Leipzig, Engelmann.)

Trembley, Abraham, 1745. Observations upon several newly discovered species of freshwater Polypi. *Philosophical Transactions.* London. **43** (Numb. 474) : 169-183.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE GENERIC NAME "STENTOR" OKEN, 1815 (CLASS CILIOPHORA, SUB-CLASS CILIATA)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)261)

In correspondence relating to the name *Entamoeba* Casagrandi and Barbagallo, 1895, Professor Harold Kirby (University of California, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.) drew my attention to the fact that the name universally applied to the well-known genus of Ciliates known as *Stentor* was invalid and suggested that the problems involved should be studied by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature as a preliminary to name *Stentor* Oken, 1815, being placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. I at once asked Professor Kirby to prepare a statement of the case for con-

sideration by the Commission, and this he kindly undertook to do at the first opportunity. The investigation has proved unexpectedly complicated, for it was found not only that the generic name *Stentor* Oken is invalid, being a junior homonym of the name *Stentor* St. Hilaire, 1812 (as was already known), but also that no effective type selection had apparently ever been made for the genus *Stentor* Oken and further that the identity of the only originally included species (*Stentor solitarius* Oken, 1815) that could be regarded as being a member of the genus as at present universally understood was open to doubt. All of these questions are dealt with fully in the paper prepared by Professor Kirby, which is now laid before the Commission for consideration.

2. In submitting this paper, Professor Kirby deliberately stopped short of formulating concrete proposals for the consideration of the Commission, asking me, as Secretary to the Commission, to undertake this task. This I consented to do and the present Report has accordingly been prepared for the consideration of the Commission. When the present Report was in draft, I submitted it to Professor Kirby, who notified me that he was in agreement with the conclusions and recommendations now submitted.

3. In approaching the present task, I started with the premise that in the case of a name such as *Stentor* Oken every responsible zoologist would recognise how grave would be the confusion if it were found necessary to reject that name for purely technical nomenclatorial reasons and would strongly support the use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers to prevent so disastrous a result. In the following paragraphs I deal briefly with each of the three problems which, as Professor Kirby explained, arise in the present case.

4. *On the measures necessary to provide availability for the generic name* Stentor *Oken*, 1815 : The first step necessary in any plan to preserve the current use of the generic name *Stentor* would be the suppression, under the Plenary Powers, of the older generic name *Stentor* St. Hilaire, 1812 ; no possible objection could be raised to this course, since, as Professor Kirby pointed out, the name *Stentor* St. Hilaire is a name that was applied to a genus of monkeys which has at least two older available names. Once St. Hilaire's *Stentor* had been removed from the field in this way, the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815, would cease to be invalid, as the junior homonym of another generic name. The next question to be considered is whether Oken, in his *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, consistently applied the principles of binominal nomenclature (as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25) and therefore whether the name *Stentor* Oken is an available name. On this general subject I have submitted a Report (Z.N. (S.)153) to* the Commission in accordance with a request addressed to me by it at its Paris Session, in which I reach the conclusion that Oken did not, in the *Lehrbuch*, satisfy the provision cited above and therefore that new names published in the *Lehrbuch* did not acquire any rights under the Law of Priority. At the same time I draw attention to the fact that, if the Commission accept the conclusion reached in my Report, the names in the *Lehrbuch* will fall to be dealt with under the special procedure laid down by the Thirteenth

*See pp.193—201 of the present volume.

International Congress of Zoology for the purpose of validating with the utmost despatch generic names of importance that might in such cases be found to be invalid (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63-66). Clearly the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815, would come under this heading and I accordingly recommend that, simultaneously with the adoption of my Report on the status of Oken's *Lehrbuch*, the name *Stentor* Oken should be validated under the Plenary Powers.

5. *Certain old generic names associated with the* Stentor *problem* : Professor Kirby pointed out that the name *Linza* Schrank, 1802, a name which has never been used, is a potential danger to the name *Stentor* Oken, since no type species has ever been selected for Schrank's genus and some of the species originally included in it are stentorids. I fully support, therefore, the conclusion reached by Professor Kirby that this name should now be suppressed under the Plenary Powers and thus rendered incapable of causing confusion in the literature. Similarly, I support Professor Kirby's conclusion that the long-forgotten name *Eclissa* Modeer, 1790, and its variant *Ecclissa* Schrank, 1802, should be suppressed under the Plenary Powers.

6. *On the type species of the genus* Stentor *Oken*, 1815 : As already noted in the present Report, no nominal species appears ever to have been validly selected to be the type species of the genus *Stentor* Oken, 1815 ; the selection of a type species is naturally an indispensable preliminary to the definition of the genus. Professor Kirby pointed out that *Stentor solitarius* Oken, 1815, is the only originally included species, the selection of which as the type species could secure the continued use of the name *Stentor* in its accustomed sense, but that there are substantial reasons which would render the selection of this species as the type species open to strong objection. In the first place, it must be noted that the name *Stentor solitarius* Oken was not based upon a description by Oken of a new species, but was published as a *nom. nov. pro* the species referred to by Müller (O.F.) (1773) as *Vorticella stentorea*. Next, we have to note that Müller never published this name as a new name ; what he did was to place in the genus *Vorticella* the species which Linnaeus in 1758 had named *Hydra stentoria* (a name which in 1767 Linnaeus himself emended to *stentorea*). Thus, the identity of Oken's *Stentor solitarius* turns entirely upon the identity of the species *Hydra stentoria* Linnaeus. Professor Kirby examined the taxonomic questions involved and reached the conclusion that, prior to Ehrenberg's work, and, in particular, his *Die Infusionsthierchen* of 1838, it is impossible to identify with certainty to what species should be applied to names published for colourless stentorids. It was to overcome these difficulties that (as explained in Professor Kirby's paper) I suggested (*in litt.*) that the best course would be for the Commission to use its Plenary Powers to secure that Ehrenberg's figure for *Stentor mülleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, should be taken to define the nominal species, to be designated as the type species of *Stentor* Oken. The advantage of this course lies in the fact that Ehrenberg's name *Stentor mülleri* is a substitute name for Müller's *Vorticella stentoria*, which (as already explained) is objectively identical with Oken's *Stentor solitarius*. This suggestion commended itself to Professor Kirby and is included in the proposal submitted at the close of the present Report. It is naturally an essential part of that plan that the specific name *mülleri* Ehrenberg

should be preserved for the species to which it is always applied. Accordingly it is proposed not only that the specific name *stentoria* Linnaeus, 1758 (and its emendation *stentorea* Linnaeus, 1767), both being specific names for species which cannot be certainly identified, should be suppressed under the Plenary Powers, but also that the specific name *solitarius* Oken should be suppressed for similar reasons. The suppression of *nomina dubia*, when their clarification might give rise to confusion, is clearly the best means of promoting stability in nomenclature and of avoiding confusion. If these names are disposed of in this way, it will be necessary to designate some other nominal species to be the type species of the genus *Stentor* Oken. Clearly, the most appropriate choice would be the nominal species *Stentor müllerí* Ehrenberg, 1832, as defined by the description and figures published by that author in 1838.

7. The settlement of the *Stentor* problem on the foregoing lines would provide valid force for the current use of that name, without causing the slightest inconvenience or difficulty in any other field. I accordingly recommend the foregoing solution to the favourable consideration of the Commission. The detailed action recommended is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers :—

(a) to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not of the Law of Homonymy the under-mentioned generic names :—

(i) *Eclissa* Modeer, 1790 ;

(ii) *Ecclissa* Schrank, 1802 ;

(iii) *Linza* Schrank, 1802 ;

(b) to suppress for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy the generic name *Stentor* St. Hilaire, 1812 :

(c) to validate the generic name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (in the event of Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* being declared unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes) ;

(d) to suppress the under-mentioned specific names for the purposes of the Law of Priority :—

(i) *stentoria* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Hydra stentoria*) ;

(ii) *stentorea* (emend. of *stentoria*) Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Hydra stentorea*) ;

(iii) *solitarius* Oken, 1815 (as published in the binominal combination *Stentor solitarius*) ;

(e) to direct that the name *Stentor müllerí* Ehrenberg, 1832, is to be interpreted by reference to the description and figures published therefor by Ehrenberg in 1838 (*Die Infusionsth.* : 262) ;

(f) to designate *Stentor müllerí* Ehrenberg, 1832, as defined in (e) above, to be the type species of *Stentor* Oken, 1815 ;

(2) to place the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (type species, by designation under the Plenary Powers under (1) (f) above: *Stentor muelleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, as defined under the Plenary Powers under (e) above) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(a) the four generic names proposed under (1) (a) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers ;

(b) the name *Stentor* St. Hilaire, 1812, proposed under (1) (b) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers ;

(c) the under-mentioned generic names which are junior objective synonyms of *Stentor* Oken, 1815 :—

(i) *Tubaria* Thienemann, 1828 :

(ii) *Stentorella* Reichenbach, 1828 :

(4) to place the specific name *muelleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, as published in the binominal combination *Stentor muelleri*, as defined under the Plenary Powers under (1) (e) above, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ;

(5) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* the three specific names specified in (1) (d) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers.

REQUEST FOR A RULING ON THE QUESTION OF THE TYPE SPECIES OF "ANCILLA" LAMARCK, 1799 (CLASS GASTROPODA)

By KATHERINE V. W. PALMER

(*Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)170)

Ancilla was proposed by Lamarck, 1799, *Mém. Soc. Hist. nat. Paris* **1** : 70. Following the description of the genus is "Volute . . . Martini conch. 2, p. 359, t. 65. f. 722-724."

The species is not cited by name by Lamarck, but it had been named by Gmelin, 1792, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **6** : 3467, *Voluta* ampla . . . Volute . . . Martini 2, t. 65, fig. 722-724 (the same reference as that of Lamarck). The species is still regarded as valid.

Does not the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 then become *Voluta ampla* Gmelin, 1792, by monotypy ?

ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF "ANCILLA" LAMARCK, 1799 (CLASS GASTROPODA), A GENUS ESTABLISHED WITH NO CITED NOMINAL SPECIES

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)170)

When in 1937 Mrs. Katherine Palmer submitted her application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a ruling on the question of the type species of the genus *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, there existed no express provision in the *Règles* on the procedure to be followed in determining the type species of a genus, to which species had been referred by the original author of the generic name but none of those species had on that occasion been cited under a binominal name. The only guide then available

was the feeble and uncertain light thrown by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 46 (1912, *Smithson. Publ.* **2060** : 104-107).

2. At Paris in 1948 the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the recommendation of the International Commission, substituted for the ambiguous provisions of *Opinion* 46 a provision under which, in the case of a nominal genus established without any nominal species as being referable thereto, the nominal species first assigned to the genus by a subsequent author is, or are, to be treated as the sole species originally included in the genus ; where only one such species is cited by the first subsequent author that species is the type species by monotypy ; where two or more such species are so cited, the type species of the genus is whichever of those species is first so selected by a subsequent author acting under Rule (g) in Article 30 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 159-160, 346). It is in the light of this provision therefore that it is necessary to examine the problem submitted by Mrs. Palmer.

3. Following the publication of the Paris decision referred to above, I applied (18th March 1951) to Dr. L. R. Cox (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) for information on the question of what was the first nominal species to be assigned to the genus *Ancilla* Lamarck. Dr. Cox replied on the following day as follows :—

> This question seems easily settled. The first nominal species assigned to *Ancilla* was *Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801 (*Syst. Anim. sans Vertèbr.* : 73), founded on Martini, *Conch.* 2, t. 65, fig. 731. This is therefore the type species by monotypy. It is a Recent Indo-Pacific species belonging to the same group as *Voluta ampla* Gmelin, so that the change in type-species has no effect on nomenclature.

4. When as in the present case the Congress clarifies a hitherto obscure provision in the *Règles*, there is always a danger that in individual cases the application of the revised provision will lead to a disturbance of existing nomenclatorial practice sufficiently serious to call for remedial action under the Plenary Powers. In the present case however it appears from the information furnished by Dr. Cox that, although the application of the Paris provision will lead to a change in the type species of the genus *Ancilla* Lamarck, the species (*Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck) which becomes the type species under the foregoing provision is considered by specialists to be congeneric with the species (*Voluta ampla* Gmelin, 1792) referred to, but not cited by name, by Lamarck when he established the nominal genus *Ancilla*. On the available evidence, therefore, there does not appear to be any ground for anticipating difficulties arising from the application of the Paris provision in this case.

5. In the circumstances, it appears that the action called for in answer to the question raised by Mrs. Palmer is a ruling by the Commission : (1) stating that under the *Règles*, as revised by the Paris Congress, *Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801, is the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, by monotypy ; (2) placing the generic name *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, with the above species as type species, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ; (3) placing the specific name *cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the combination *Ancilla cinnamomea*, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "MELANARGIA" MEIGEN, 1828, BY SUPPRESSING THE NAME "AGAPETES" BILLBERG, 1820 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By JIŘÍ PACLT
(*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)708)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers for the purpose of suppressing the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820, thereby validating the well-known name *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828, for the Palaearctic genus of SATYRIDAE which has borne this name continuously ever since its publication 125 years ago. The facts of this case are set out below.

2. The first name given to this genus was *Arge* Hübner, [1819] (*Verz. bek. Schmett.* (4) : 60), but this name was invalid, being a junior homonym of *Arge* Schrank, 1802 (*Faun. boica* **2** (2) : 209).

3. A year later the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820 (*Enum. Ins.* : 78) was published in a catalogue of the butterflies contained in Billberg's collection; no generic diagnosis was given, the only indication given by Billberg as to how he interpreted this genus being the citation of the names of two species now recognised as being congeneric and both placed by current authors in the genus *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (see paragraph 4 below). The two species so cited were: *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 474); *Papilio lachesis* Hübner, 1790 (*Beitr. Schmett.* **2** (3): 70, pl. 3, figs. P.1, 2♂). Of these species the former was selected as the type species of this genus by Scudder in 1875 (*Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci.*, Boston **10** : 104).

4. The name which the present application is concerned to save, *Melanargia* Meigen was published in 1828 (*Syst. Beschr. europ. Schmett.* **1** (3) : 97), where it was applied to *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus, 1758, and to a number of its European allies. Meigen did not designate a type species for this genus, but Kirby in 1894 (*in* Allen's *Nat. Libr.*, Handbook Lepidoptera **1** Butt. **1** : 240) selected *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus to be its type species.

5. With the exception of a few authors who at one time erroneously applied the name *Satyrus* Latreille, 1810 (now placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with *Papilio actaea* Esper, [1780], as type species) to this genus, all subsequent workers have, with a few very recent exceptions, called this genus by the name *Melanargia* Meigen. Further, up to 1948 they were perfectly correct in so doing, for it was not until that year that the International Congress of Zoology amended the definition of the expression "indication" as used in Proviso (*a*) to Article 25 of the *Règles* in such a way as to accord availability to the names of genera established without any verbal diagnosis and distinguished only by the citation thereunder of the names of previously established nominal species (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 78-80). As the purpose of this change was to promote stability and uniformity in nomenclature by validating such of the names belonging to this class as were in general use, it must certainly be concluded conversely that it was intended also to give

relief in any case such as the present where the grant of this concession would have an exactly opposite result, that is, where it would itself directly contribute to instability and confusion. The present application is accordingly submitted as falling directly within the intention of the arrangements contemplated at the time when Article 25 of the *Règles* was modified in the manner described above.

6. The action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take is that it should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers to suppress the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) place the generic name *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species. by selection by Kirby (1894) : *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus, 1758) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(3) place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *galathea* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio galathea* (specific name of type species of *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828) ;

(*b*) *lachesis* Hübner, 1790, as published in the combination *Papilio lachesis* ;

(4) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Arge* Hübner, [1819] (invalid junior homonym of *Arge* Schrank, 1802) ;

(*b*) *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820, as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers.

SUPPORT FOR DR. J. PACLT'S PROPOSAL FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE GENERIC NAME "AGAPETES" BILLBERG, 1820 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By N. D. RILEY
(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)708)

(Letter dated 7th November 1952)

I am interested to learn that Dr. Paclt has suggested to the Commission that they should use their Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Agapetes* Billberg. As a lepidopterist, I am entirely in favour of this. This name has crept into the literature in a somewhat furtive way during the last quarter of a century, and its suppression would formally re-establish the much better known generic name *Melanargia*. All students of the Palaearctic Rhopalocera will, I am sure, be everlastingly grateful. The case seems to be a perfectly straightforward one in which only by the use of the Plenary Powers can a clear-cut decision be reached.

CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT PART

(*continued from front wrapper*)

Page

Report on the status of new names published in Oken [1815-1816], *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*. By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission* 193

Appendix 1. By the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 202

Appendix 2. By Karl Jordan (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*).. 204

Appendix 3. By Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) 206

Appendix 4. By T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) 207

On the need for validating the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora) for use in its accustomed sense. By Harold Kirby (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 208

Report on the status of the generic name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora, Sub-Class Ciliata). By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission* 214

Request for a Ruling on the question of the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda). By Katherine V. W. Palmer (*Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) .. 219

On the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda), a genus established with no cited nominal species. By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission* 219

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), by suppressing the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820. By Jiří Paclt (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*) 221

Support for Dr. J. Paclt's proposal for the suppression of the generic name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By N. D. Riley (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) .. 222

Printed by Metchim & Son Limited, 8 Storey's Gate, London, S.W.1.